

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 being independent. Applicant herein amends claims 1, 6, 11, and 16. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least at paragraphs [0024], [0036], [0050]-[0052], and at Fig. 4. No new matter has been added.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0217166 to Dal Canto et al. (hereinafter “Dal Canto”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0177073 to Snyder et al. (hereinafter “Snyder”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended as proposed during the interview and are believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11 as presently amended, recite in part:

sending, by a client computing device, a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server;

receiving, by the client computing device, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information **aggregated by the RAP web server** from multiple sources;

generating, by the client computing device, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts... wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent application files** that point to the one or more respective applications

Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto and Snyder, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements of independent claims 1, 6, and 11 as presently amended.

Dal Canto and Snyder Fail to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest the Features of Independent Claims 1, 6, and 11.

Dal Canto is directed to “remote access of digital data and services and, more particularly to a service provisioning system architecture for providing universal stateless digital and computer services.” (Dal Canto, page 1, para [0002]). The meta-desktop of Dal Canto is a top-level selection interface that is used to connect the client device to a particular digital communications service. (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]). Dal Canto describes the creation and display of a “meta-desktop” which is pushed to a client device, and includes advertising, branding, and other service-related functions along with icons representing various services available to an authenticated user. (Dal Canto, page 6, para [0047], page 7, para [0049]). “Preferably, the Meta-Desktop module 220 transmits, pushes or

broadcasts dynamically changing and constantly updated displays to the client devices 400.” (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]).

However, Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*sending, by a client computing device, a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server; receiving, by the client computing device, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information aggregated by the RAP web server from multiple sources; generating, by the client computing device, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts... wherein the one or more shortcuts are independent application files that point to the one or more respective applications*” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Thus, Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 6, and 11 amended as discussed in the interview.

Snyder fails to remedy the deficiencies in Dal Canto with respect to independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Snyder is directed to a “system [which] enables individual organizations of multiple different organizations to manage access of employees to a remotely located application hosted by an application service provider.” (Snyder, Abstract). Specifically, Snyder discusses a customer account management (CAM) system that provides secure access via an intranet or Internet to application user accounts for organizations, such as hospitals.” (Snyder, Abstract).

However, Snyder fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*sending, by a client computing device, a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server; receiving, by the client computing device, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information aggregated by the RAP web server from multiple sources; generating, by the client computing device, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts... wherein the one or more shortcuts are independent application files that point to the one or more respective applications*” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Thus, Snyder fails to remedy the deficiencies in Dal Canto with respect to independent claims 1, 6, and 11, since Snyder fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 6, and 11, amended as discussed in the interview.

Thus, Dal Canto and Snyder, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 6, and 11 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1, **dependent claims 7-10** depend from independent claim 6, and **dependent claims 12-15** depend from independent claim 11. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-15 are

allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 16 as presently amended, recites in part:

means for **sending** a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server;

means for **receiving**, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information aggregated by the RAP web server from multiple sources;

means for **generating**, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts to one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent application files** that point to the one or more respective applications

Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto and Snyder, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements of independent claim 16 as presently amended.

Dal Canto is directed to “remote access of digital data and services and, more particularly to a service provisioning system architecture for providing universal stateless digital and computer services.” (Dal Canto, page 1, para [0002]). The meta-desktop of Dal Canto is a top-level selection interface that is used to connect the client device to a particular digital communications service. (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]). Dal Canto describes the creation and display of a “meta-desktop” which is pushed to a client device, and includes advertising, branding, and other service-related functions along with icons representing various

services available to an authenticated user. (Dal Canto, page 6, para [0047], page 7, para [0049]). “Preferably, the Meta-Desktop module 220 transmits, pushes or broadcasts dynamically changing and constantly updated displays to the client devices 400.” (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]).

However, Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*means for **sending** a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server; means for **receiving**, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information aggregated by the RAP web server from multiple sources; means for **generating**, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts to one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent application files** that point to the one or more respective applications*” as recited in amended independent claim 16. Thus, Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 16 amended as discussed in the interview.

Snyder fails to remedy the deficiencies in Dal Canto with respect to independent claim 16. Snyder is directed to a “system [which] enables individual organizations of multiple different organizations to manage access of employees to a remotely located application hosted by an application service provider.” (Snyder, Abstract). Specifically, Snyder discusses a customer account management (CAM) system that provides secure access via an intranet or Internet

to application user accounts for organizations, such as hospitals.” (Snyder, Abstract).

However, Snyder fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*means for **sending** a remote application discovery request to a Remote Application Publishing (RAP) web server; means for **receiving**, responsive to the request, a discovery response from the RAP web server, the discovery response comprising remote application information aggregated by the RAP web server from multiple sources; means for **generating**, based on the discovery response, one or more shortcuts to one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent application files** that point to the one or more respective applications*” as recited in amended independent claim 16. Thus, Snyder fails to remedy the deficiencies in Dal Canto with respect to independent claim 16, since Snyder fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 16, amended as discussed in the interview.

Thus, Dal Canto and Snyder, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 16. Accordingly, independent claim 16 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 17-20 depend from independent claim 16, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that each recites.

Dal Canto does not disclose Shortcuts

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office cites “icons 440” from paragraph [0049] of Dal Canto as allegedly describing the “shortcuts” recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. An icon is understood by one skilled in the art to describe a *picture*. Often, an icon may be used as a *picture* associated with an object or file. In contrast, a shortcut is an *object or application file*, with much more functionality. Often, an icon may be used as a *picture* associated with a shortcut.

Webopedia defines an icon as “[a] small picture that represents an object or program.” <http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/i/icon.html>. Webopedia then distinguishes a shortcut as:

[a] special type of file in some operating systems that points to another file or device. You can place shortcuts on the desktop to conveniently access files that may be stored deep in the directory structure. Double-clicking the shortcut icon is the same as double-clicking the actual file.

You can control how a shortcut appears by naming it anything you want and associating a particular icon with it.

<http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/s/shortcut.html>. The specification at paragraph [0052] further describes some properties of shortcuts as “presented independent of their respective data sources, for instance, on a desktop of the

remote computing device 106, [or] via a “start” menu...” (Specification, page 20, para [0052]).

Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest shortcuts as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, or in Applicant’s specification.

Thus, Dal Canto fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent application files** that point to the one or more respective applications*” as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 as presently amended. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are allowable for at least these reasons.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Patrick D.S. Reed/ Dated: July 30, 2008

Patrick D.S. Reed (patrick@leehayes.com; x252)
Registration No. 61,227
Christopher W. Lattin (christopher@leehayes.com; x263)
Registration No. 56,064
Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com